UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,936	12/30/2003	Brett D. Brewer	306397.01	6684

22971   7590   10/24/2008
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-17,19-21,23-25 and 27-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-17,19-21,23-25,27-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 2,8-9, 18, 22, 26 are canceled. Claim 38 is newly added.

2.   Claims 1, 3-7, 10-17, 19-21, 23-25, 27-38 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

Claim 1,3,6-7,10,12-15,17,19-20, 33, 34,38 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,564,213

issued to Ruben E. Ortega et al ("Ortega") and US 2004/0143564 issued

to William Gross et al. ("Gross") and US Patent Publication

2003/0225756 issued to Songqiao Liu ("Liu") and US 2001/0053968

issued to Galitsky et al ("Galitsky").

As per independent claim 1 Ortega teaches:

 a) defining one or more query related character patterns that do not include an

explicit indicator of query submission (Figure 2A, Ref.No. 60, user types in SO);

b) monitoring entry of query defining characters by a user to detect entry of a

defined query related character pattern (Figure 2A, displays the auto completion

strings (refinement options) for "SO");

providing the user with one or more suggested query refinement options each

time a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the

user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission" and "replacing the

detected defined query related character (Figure 2A, Reference No. 62, auto

completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36,

Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for "SO" , the

terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one

and the refinement option replaces the "SO" (defined query related character

pattern) it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the

incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for "SONY"

and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus).

Ortega does not explicitly teach providing the user with an updated query

result each time a defined query related character is detected without requiring

the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission. Gross does

teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each

character in a search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate

feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so

can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify Ortega with providing the user with an updated

query result each time a defined query related character is detected without

requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission to

provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering

additional search characters (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross does not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the

detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu

does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref. no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183

(broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms

added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search

criteria to a search query... It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a

synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a

broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search

criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach wherein neither the

synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related

character pattern. Galitsky does teach this at paragraphs 45, 52-53, as options to

refine an input query and synonym substitution unit maps words in an input query

to their pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes substituting input query words

with pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined synonym could obviously be set up to

include words which do not include the character patterns of the query input

words.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Ortega, Gross, Liu with teach wherein neither

the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query

related character pattern to allow a user to clarify a query as described by

Galitsky at paragraph [0045].

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting

the suggested query refinement options based on a history of results previously

selected by the one or more users (column 2, lines 30-35, most popular items in

the database).

As per claim 6, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein one defined query related character pattern is a string of characters

followed by a space (Figure 2B).

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein one query related character pattern is a string of characters followed by

a predefined time delay before additional characters are entered (column 2, lines

20-25).

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising providing a user input that allows the user to adjust the query

related character patterns (Figure 2A Reference 60).

Claim 12 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 1.

As per independent claim 13 Ortega teaches:

providing a user with one or more suggested query refinement options as the

user enters query defining characters and "replacing the query defining

character" (Figure 2A, Reference No. 62, auto completion strings (refinement

options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto

completion strings (refinement options) for "SO" , the terms and phrases

(refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the refinement

option replaces the "SO" (query defining character) it is added to the search field

and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion

strings (refinement options) for "SONY" and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates

search without moving stylus).

b) detecting entry of a query defining word by the user without requiring a user to

provide an explicit indicator of query submission (Figure 2B, displays results of

the detecting (refinement options) for "SONY" and column 5, lines 46-51, user

initiates search without moving stylus).

  Ortega does not explicitly teach providing the user with an updated query

results each time entry of a query defining word is detected without requiring the

user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission and wherein the

query defining word includes a string of characters followed by a predefined time

delay before additional characters are entered by the user. Gross does teach this

limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a

search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and

paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on

the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to modify Ortega with providing the user with an updated query result each

time entry of a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to

provide the explicit indicator of the query submission and   wherein the query

defining word includes a string of characters followed by a predefined time delay

before additional characters are entered by the user to provide immediate

feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search

characters as described by Gross (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the

detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu

does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183

(broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms

added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search

criteria to a search query. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym

suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a

broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern. Galitsky does teach this at paragraphs 45, 52-53, as options to refine a input query and synonym substitution unit maps words in an input query to their pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes substituting input query words with pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined synonym could obviously be set up to include words which do not include the character patterns of the query input words.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ortega, Gross, Liu with teach wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern to allow a user to clarify a query as described by Galitsky at paragraph [0045].

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches: further comprising tracking queries entered by one or more users and adjusting the suggested query refinement options based on a history of queries previously entered by the one or more users(column 2, lines 20-24 and column 3, lines 10-12)..

As per claim 15, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

comprising tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting the

suggested query refinement options based on a history of results previously

selected by the one or more users (column 2, lines 30-35, most popular items in

the database).

As per claim 17, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein one defined query related character pattern is a string of characters

followed by a space (Figure 2B).

As per claim 19, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the updated query result list includes result listings from a user hard

drive, an intranet server, and an Internet server (column 3, line 25-35).

Claim 20 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 13.

As per claim 33 same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein

the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT

(broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

As per claim 34 same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

 wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein

the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT

(broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

As per claim 38, same as claim arguments above and Galitsky teaches:

Wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion includes

the query related character pattern (paragraphs 45, 52-53, as options to refine a

input query and synonym substitution unit maps words in an input query to their

pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes substituting input query words with

pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined synonym could obviously be set up to

include words which do not include the character patterns of the query input

words.))

Claims 5, 21, 23-25, 27-28,35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,564,213 issued to Ruben

E. Ortega et al ("Ortega") and US 2004/0143564 issued to William Gross

et al ("Gross") and US Patent Publication 2003/0225756 issued to

Songqiao Liu ("Liu") and US 2001/0053968 issued to Galitsky et al

("Galitsky") in view of US Publication Number 2006/0112178 issued to

Taylor N. Van Vleet ("Van Vleet").

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and Liu

and Galitsky do not explicitly teach further comprising providing a visual indicator

to the user when an updated query result list is provided to the user. Van Vleet

does teach this limitation (paragraph 12, 30 and Figure 3, as highlighting the

updated search results, Figure 3: "new search results since") to personalize

search result items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu with providing a

visual indicator to the user each time the updated query result list is provided to

the user to personalize search result items as described by Van Vleet (paragraph

12).

As per independent claim 21 Ortega teaches:

 a) providing a user with auto-complete alternatives as the user enters query

defining characters(Figure 2A, Reference No. 62 , auto completion strings

(refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A

displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for "SO" and at Figure

2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings

(refinement options) for "SONY");

b) detecting entry of a completed query defining word by the user (Figure 2B,

displays results of the detecting (refinement options) for "SONY");

d) providing the user with query refinement options related to the query defining

word without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query

submission and "replacing the query defining word in the query" (Figure 2B,

displays auto completion strings (refinement options) for "SONY" and column 5,

lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus) (Figure 2A, Reference

No. 62, auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column

5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement

options) for "SO" , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and

the user selects one and the refinement option replaces the "SO" (defined query

related character pattern) it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the

display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement

options) for "SONY" and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without

moving stylus)

e) determining whether the user selects a provided query refinement option

(column 5, lines 37-40, selecting and submitting the auto completion strings

(selected refinement option) for searching).

Ortega does not explicitly teach providing the user with a query result list each

time a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the

explicit indicator of query submission and providing the user with an updated

query result list when it is determined that the user has selected a provided query

refinement option.   Gross does teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11,

as immediately after each character in a search sting is entered by the user the

user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide

immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional

search characters. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega with providing the

user with a query result list each time a query defining word is detected without

requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission and providing the user with an updated query result list when it is determined that the user has selected a provided query refinement option to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters as described by Gross(paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern. Galitsky does teach this at paragraphs 45, 52-53, as options to refine a input query and synonym substitution unit maps words in an input query to their pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes substituting input query words with pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined synonym could obviously be set up to include words which do not include the character patterns of the query input words.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Ortega, Gross, Liu with teach wherein neither

the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query

related character pattern to allow a user to clarify a query as described by

Galitsky at paragraph [0045].

Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitsky do not explicitly teach providing a

visual indicator to the user each time the updated query result list is provided to

the user. Van Vleet does teach this limitation (paragraph 12, 30 and Figure 3, as

highlighting the updated search results, Figure 3: "new search results since") to

personalize search result items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu and

Galitsky with   providing a visual indicator to the user each time the updated

query result list is provided to the user to personalize search result items as

described by Van Vleet (paragraph 12).

As per claim 23, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the updated query result list includes result listings from a user hard

drive, an intranet server, and an Internet server (column 3, line 25-35).

Claim 24 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 21.

As per independent claim 25 Ortega teaches:

 a) a query entry text box for entering query defining characters (Figure 2A,

search box, Ref.No. 60);

b) a query refinement option list of user selectable query refinement options(

Figure 2A, Reference No. 62 , auto completion strings (refinement options)) that

is incrementally updated as a query is entered into the query entry text box …

(Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto

completion strings (refinement options) for "SO" and at Figure 2B the display

shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for

"SONY", user can initiate search without moving stylus away from the selected

string) and "replacing the query defining characters in the query (column 5, lines

23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for

"SO" , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user

selects one and the refinement option replaces the "SO" -it is added to the

search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto

completion strings (refinement options) for "SONY" .

    Ortega does not explicitly teach a query result list that is incrementally

updated as a query is entered into the query box without requiring the user to

provide the explicit indicator of the query submission. Gross does teach this

limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a

search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and

paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on

the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Ortega with a query result list that is incrementally updated as a query is entered

into the query box without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the

query submission to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the

desirability of entering additional search characters (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the

detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu

does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183

(broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms

added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search

criteria to a search query... It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a

synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a

broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search

criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach wherein neither the

synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related

character pattern. Galitsky does teach this at paragraphs 45, 52-53, as options to

refine a input query and synonym substitution unit maps words in an input query

to their pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes substituting input query words

with pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined synonym could obviously be set up to

include words which do not include the character patterns of the query input

words.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Ortega, Gross, Liu with teach wherein neither

the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query

related character pattern to allow a user to clarify a query as described by

Galitsky at paragraph [0045].

Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitski do not explicitly teach a visual

indicator that indicates when the query result list is updated. Van Vleet does

teach this limitation (paragraph 12, 30 as highlighting the updated search results,

Figure 3: "new search results since") to personalize search result items. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify Ortega and

Gross and Liu and Galitsky with a visual indicator that indicates when the query
result list is

updated to personalize search result items as described by Van Vleet (paragraph
12).

As per claim 27, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising a user selectable search icon for manually executing a query

defined by characters in the query entry text box (Figure 2A, Ref. No. 66).

As per claim 28, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the query refinement option list is semi-transparent (Figure 2A, Ref. No.

62).

As per claim 35 same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein

the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT

(broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

.**As per claim 36** same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein

the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT

(broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

.

> **Claim 4 , 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**
>
> **over Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitsky as applied to claims 1**
>
> **above and further in view of US Patent Number 6,006225 issued to**
>
> **Dwayne E. Bowman et al ("Bowman").**

As per claim 4, 16 same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and

Liu and Galitsky do not explicitly teach further comprising tracking results

selected by one or more users and adjusting an order of the updated query result

list based on a history of results previously selected by the one or more users .

Bowman does teach this limitation at column 7, lines 45-50 to produce a

successful query result. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega and Gross and

Liu and Galitsky with tracking results selected by one or more users and

adjusting an order of the updated query result list based on a history of results

previously selected by the one or more users to produce a successful query

result as described by Bowman (column 2, lines 44-46).

As per claim 16, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and

Liu and Galitsky do not explicitly teach tracking results selected by one or more

users and adjusting an order of the updated query result list based on a history of

results previously selected by the one or more users. Bowman does teach this

limitation at column 7, lines 45-50 to produce a successful query result. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitsky with

tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting an order of the

updated query result list based on a history of results previously selected by one

or more users and adjusting an order to produce a successful query result as

described by Bowman (column 2, lines 44-46).

**Claim 29 is   rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitski in view Van Vleet as applied to
claims 25 above, and further in view of US Patent Application
Publication Number 2006/0129915 issued to Ning-Ping Chan ("Chan").**

As per claim 29, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and

Liu and Galitsky in view of Van Vleet do not explicitly teach wherein the query

result list is animated for a predetermined period of time after the query result list

is updated. Chan does teach this limitation at (paragraph 54, blinking search

results) to provide a visual cue. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega

and Gross and Liu and Galitsky in view of Van Vleet with teach wherein the

query result list is animated for a predetermined period of time after the query

result list is updated to provide a visual cue as described by Chan (paragraph

114).

Claim   11, 30-32, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,564,213 issued to Ruben E.

Ortega et al ("Ortega") and US 2004/0143564 issued to William Gross et

al. ("Gross") and US Patent Publication 2003/0225756 issued to

Songqiao Liu ("Liu") and US 2001/0053968 issued to Galitsky et al

("Galitsky") and further in view of in view of US Patent Application

Publication Number 2003/0182463 issued to Jeffery W. Valk ("Valk").

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and

Liu and Galitsky do not explicitly teach in response to a change in a connection

speed at a client-server connection … to occur more frequently as the connection

speed increases. Valk does teach this limitation (paragraph 59, as connection

speed limits ability to provide information such as dialup versus high speed and it

is desirable to limit the amount of information sent to what is needed to perform

complex tasks, can rune quickly even in the most remote locations on low-

bandwidth for smaller companies, yet remain robust enough to handle the

complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies. It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to modify the datasets (defined query related character patterns) of Ortega

and Gross and Liu and Galitsky with in response to a change in a connection

speed at a client-server connection … to occur more frequently as the connection

speed increases to perform complex tasks, can rune quickly even in the most

remote locations on low-bandwidth for smaller companies , yet remain robust

enough to handle the complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies as

described by Valk (paragraph 14, lines 19-26).

As per independent claim 30 Ortega teaches:

 a) a user input device enabling input of query defining text characters (Figure

2A, search box, Ref.No. 60);

b) a display (Figure 1);

c) a data content that is searchable (column 2, lines 10-15, searchable

database);

a network connection for accessing at least a portion of the data content (column

2, lines 10-15);

d) a memory in which machine instructions are stored (Figure 1);

e) a processor that is coupled to the user input device, to the display, to the data

content, to the network connection and to the memory, the processor executing

the machine instructions to carry out a plurality of functions (Figure 1), including:

i) defining one or more query related character patterns that do not include

an explicit indicator of query submission (column 2, lines 6-8, generating auto

completion strings datasets);

ii) monitoring entry of query defining characters by a user to detect entry

of a defined query related character pattern (column 5, lines 27-29, query

entered and suggested auto completion strings (character pattern) are

displayed);

providing the user with query refinement options each related to the detected

defined query character pattern without requiring the user to provide the explicit

indicator of the query submission (Figure 2A, Reference No. 62 , auto

completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36,

Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for "SO" and

at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings

(refinement options) for "SONY" and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search

without moving stylus);

replacing the detected defined query related character pattern (column 5, lines

23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for

"SO", the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user

selects one and the refinement option replaces the "SO" -it is added to the

search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto

completion strings (refinement options) for "SONY".

changing the defined query related character patterns (column 2, lines 35-37, as

datasets (defined query related character patterns) are customized for users or

user groups and column 3, lines 42-50 teaches a variety of devices such as PDA

and conventional PCs and column 4, lines 34-44, as downloading new datasets

(defined query related character patterns).

Ortega does not explicitly teach searching the data content and providing the

user with an updated query result when a … query … is detected without

requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission. Gross

does teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each

character in a search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate

feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so

can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Ortega with searching the data content and providing the user with an

updated query result when a … query … is detected without requiring the user to

provide the explicit indicator of query submission to provide the explicit indicator

of the query submission to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the

desirability of entering additional search characters (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the

detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu

does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183

(broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern. Galitsky does teach this at paragraphs 45, 52-53, as options to refine a input query and synonym substitution unit maps words in an input query to their pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes substituting input query words with pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined synonym could obviously be set up to include words which do not include the character patterns of the query input words.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ortega, Gross, Liu with teach wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern to allow a user to clarify a query as described by Galitsky at paragraph [0045].

Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitski do not explicitly teach in response to a change in a connection speed at a client-server connection. Valk does teach this limitation (paragraph 59, as connection speed limits ability to provide

information such as dialup versus high speed and it is desirable to limit the

amount of information sent to what is needed to perform complex tasks, can rune

quickly even in the most remote locations on low-bandwidth for smaller

companies, yet remain robust enough to handle the complicated needs facing

multi-billion dollar companies. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the datasets (defined

query related character patterns) of Ortega and Gross and Liu and Galitski with

in response to a change in a connection speed at a client-server connection to

perform complex tasks, can rune quickly even in the most remote locations on

low-bandwidth for smaller companies , yet remain robust enough to handle the

complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies as described by Valk

(paragraph 14, lines 19-26).

As per claim 31, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the searchable database resides on one or more remote computers and

data used to define the one or more query related character patterns resides on

a user terminal (column 3, lines 5-15, column 4, lines 36-40).

As per claim 32, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the data content includes data stored on a user hard drive, data stored

on an intranet server, and data stored on an Internet server (column 3, line 25-

35).

As per claim 37 same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein

the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT

(broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed June 19, 2008 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Applicant argue prior art of record does not teach replacement.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant

relies (i.e., replacement) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the

claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181,

26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, the claim language: "for

replacing... " is intended use.

Applicant argues Ortega fails to teach replacement suggestion for a query

, wherein the replacement suggestion does not begin with the query related

character pattern. Ortega teaches at column 3, lines 35-40 a user to search a

database for desired items using textual queries. In column 5, lines 22-54, an

example of a search field such as Amazon.com, user begins entering search

term and suggestions are displayed to the user. The user may select suggestions

and initiate a new search and results. Ortega teaches at column 6, lines 52-67,

auto completion may use a related terms table which has a keyword associated

with related terms for example "cosmos" related to "Sagan" and "space" , once a

user enters a word which looks like a keyword the auto completion client

suggests adding these terms. Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach

wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins

with the query related character pattern. Galitsky does teach this at paragraphs

45, 52-53, as options to refine a input query and synonym substitution unit maps

words in an input query to their pre-defined synonyms. (Galitsky describes

substituting input query words with pre-defined synonym. The pre-defined

synonym could obviously be set up to include words which do not include the

character patterns of the query input words.) It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ortega,

Gross, Liu with teach wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the

broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern to allow a

user to clarify a query as described by Galitsky at paragraph [0045].

Applicant argues Gross does not teach a predefined time delay. Examiner finds Gross teaches providing the user with an updated query results each time entry of a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission and wherein the query defining word includes a string of characters followed by a predefined time delay before additional characters are entered by the user at (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14).

Conclusion

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from
the examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is
571-272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The
fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is
assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from
the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information
for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public
PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-
direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-
free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service
Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-
9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2167

Susan Rayyan
October 20, 2008